

displaying a plurality of subgroup labels, each of which identifies a set of related controls;

receiving a single user action associated with a control,

toggling the selection state of this associated control without affecting the selection state of any other control;

whereby a user can see at a glance which subgroups and options are available and thus more quickly locate relevant options, and whereby a user can see at a glance which options are currently selected, making searches faster and easier.

Remarks

All changes in Amendment A that the Office Action identified as "new matter" have been cancelled above.

Pending claims 25-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, stating that the specification lacked support for "option control", "option label", "predetermined syntax", "zero or more", "each of which have two visually distinct state", "each of which has only one state" as recited in pending claims 25, 32 and 33. All of these items have been changed in new claims 34-42.

In particular, "option control" is now "control" and "option label" is now "label", thus exactly matching the terms used in Figure 3 (and used frequently in the specification). The phrases "predetermined syntax" and "zero or more" have been deleted. The phrase "visually distinct" has been deleted. Note that the two control states are clearly specified in Figure 5: "selected" and "unselected". The phrase "each of which has only one state" has been deleted.

Regarding the telephone interview: Examiner agreed to change the second Office Action to non-final since the final rejection was issued without providing the constructive assistance that applicant requested pursuant to M.P.E.P. 707.07(j) and M.P.E.P. 2173.02. Applicant believes that in light of "(A) The content of the particular application disclosure" and "(B) The teachings of the prior art", all of the issues raised in the second Office Action could have been addressed

by the Examiner's constructive assistance in a manner that would have been acceptable to applicant and would have placed the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Applicant has in good faith and with diligent effort attempted to address all concerns specified in the Office Actions. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant, acting pro se, respectfully requests that an examiner "offer a definite suggestion for correction" and/or "draft one or more claims for the applicant", per M.P.E.P. 707.07(j). If any language is perceived to lack clarity and precision, applicant respectfully requests that an examiner "suggest claim language" per M.P.E.P. 2173.02.

Very respectfully,



Scott S. Lawton
Applicant Pro Se

Date

7-14-04

24 Colonial Dr
Chelmsford, MA 01824

Tel: 781-526-2462
FAX: 815-301-1907